

However, if Applicant's disagree with the Examiner and either (a) already used lexicography or (b) wish to use lexicography and therefore (under either (a) or (b)) desire a claim limitation to have a meaning other than its ordinary and accustomed meaning, the Examiner respectfully requests Applicants in their next response to expressly indicate the claim limitation at issue and show where in the specification or prosecution history the limitation is defined.

Firstly, the rejections provided in the office action fail to clearly articulate how Purcell or the alleged well known subject matter teaches each and every element of the pending claims. Thus, it is unclear how many of the claimed features are interpreted.

Secondly, neither Purcell nor the alleged well known subject matter teach each and every feature of the pending claims as described above. Thus, the Applicants may notify the Examiner whether they disagree with the Examiner's "broadest reasonable interpretation" when it is clear how the Examiner is interpreting the features of the pending claims and when the Examiner provides sufficient evidence that Purcell or the alleged well known subject matter teaches each and every feature of the pending claims.

REMARKS CONCERNING PARAGRAPH 19 OF THE OFFICE ACTION

Paragraph 19 of the office action refers to three books by White, Derfler, and Gralla respectively. If the teachings of these books are relied upon to reject any of the features of the pending claims, the Examiner must reject the claims over these books and provide an explanation of what teachings in these books teach the features of the pending claims. Furthermore, the Examiner has only provided the Applicants with photocopied indexes from each of the books. If the Examiner relies on any teachings from these books, the Examiner must provide copies of the relevant sections of the book to the Applicants.

CONCLUSION

As all of the outstanding rejections have been traversed and all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, the Applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowability. If the undersigned attorney can assist in any matters regarding examination of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Salil Pradhan et al.

Date: February 3, 2005

By Ashok K. Mannava

Ashok K. Mannava
Registration No. 45,301

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.
8221 Old Courthouse Road
Suite 104
Vienna, VA 22182
(703) 652-3822
(703) 880-5270 (facsimile)